



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/530,983	05/08/2000	GUSTAVO DECO	P000861	5072

7590 11/29/2001

HILL STEADMAN & SIMPSON
85TH FLOOR SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

OROPEZA, FRANCES P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3762

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/530,983

Applicant(s)

Deco

Examiner

Frances P Oropeza

Art Unit

3762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 16 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 16, line 17, "of" before "said test information flow" should be deleted, and

Claim 17, line 13, "of" before "said test information flow" should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7, 10-13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Andersson (US 5782885). Andersson discloses cardiac stimulation device with a neural network, a pulse generator (read as the actuator) and electrodes that delivers stimulation pulses to the heart. The IEGM signals waveforms are initially classified based on a predetermined number of IEGM-signals that are preregistered in the device, hence providing initial training to the neural network. The neural network classification system is updated as the signals are sensed, hence providing a continuous loop of ongoing training to the neural network (column 2, lines 19-34 and column 4, line 34-55). Neural networks are used to identify significant differences in the current signal and the historical signal enabling an appropriate pacing response (column 5, lines 58-64 and column 6, lines 29-31). The exciting of the system with noise, also read as a chaotic signal

or a regular signal depending on the system dynamics, is accomplished with an electrical pulse, creating an electrical field.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 8-9 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spitzer et al. (US 5092343) in view of Andersson (US 5782885) and further in view of Dorfmeister et al. (US 5995868).

Spitzer et al. teach a waveform analysis method using a neural network (22, 22') as applied to EEG and EKG signals for diagnosis/classification of the disease (column 5, lines 50-56). Spitzer does not teach treatment of the diagnosed disease. As discussed in paragraph 2 of this action, Andersson discloses a cardiac stimulation device with a neural network and teaches

Art Unit: 3762

the treatment of the diagnosed disease following classification of the disease by the neural network. Dorfmeister et al. disclose a system for dealing with change in activity states in the brain and teach the use of an electrical or magnetic medicament to activate or deactivate the appropriate physiological receptors, hence treating the detected brain abnormalities indicative of a seizure (column 6, lines 44-62).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the waveform analysis method as taught by Spitzer et al., with the ability to treat EEG related disorders as taught by Andersson using an electrical or magnetic medicament to activate or deactivate the appropriate physiological receptors as taught by Dorfmeister et al. to provide a more comprehensive diagnostic and treatment system to enable a seizure condition not only to be diagnosed, but also treated so the brain damage, resulting from the seizure activity, can be minimized.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fran Oropeza whose telephone number is (703) 605-4355. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday from 6 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela D. Sykes can be reached on (703) 308-5181. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 306-4520 for regular communication and (703) 306-4520 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3762

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

Frances P. Oropeza
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3762

FPO
11-8-01

W E Kamm

William E. Kamm
Primary Examiner

15 Nov 01